

Message

From: Williams, Antony [Williams.Antony@epa.gov]
Sent: 5/16/2020 9:13:55 PM
To: Richard, Ann [Richard.Ann@epa.gov]; Patlewicz, Grace [Patlewicz.Grace@epa.gov]
Subject: RE: Sanity check

Comments below

From: Richard, Ann <Richard.Ann@epa.gov>
Sent: Friday, May 15, 2020 6:57 PM
To: Patlewicz, Grace <Patlewicz.Grace@epa.gov>
Cc: Williams, Antony <Williams.Antony@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Sanity check

Hi Grace,

I've not heard any more from the OPPT group, but it seems that they want to expand our PFASSTRUC definition for their particular use case (to flag anything coming in for POSSIBLE consideration as PFAS), I think to include just -CF2 or -CF3 to make sure nothing (weird small molecule exceptions mostly) falls thru the cracks for their reviews.

Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)

Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP) I'm not sure where the dust might have settled on this one (Tony might be best to ask) but I don't think it will change our approach.

Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)

In a related matter, the below was a comment just submitted to the Dashboard to which I drafted response that followed – just goes to show, you can't please everyone. (The person should have started off thanking us before pissing me off.)

[AJW>] *The nice thing is with getting these comments is we get to hear what people are thinking so even this I like* ☺

chem_name:1,1-Difluoroethane

email:brpe461@ecy.wa.gov

DTXSID-URL:http://comptox.epa.gov/dashboard/dsstoxdb/results?search=DTXSID0024050

desc:

This is not PFAS, but it is on the PFASMASTER list.

This may derive from the PFASTRIER list. You should add a note that the PFASMASTER list has not been curated to a common definition of PFAS. Users may get the idea that the PFASMASTER list is an accepted standard for identifying PFAS compounds. It is not.

Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)

I also realize I probably need to respond to the OECD workgroup on their PFAS Fact cards. I'm losing steam and interest in putting energy into this.

Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)

Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)

I think I did promise

them something, however, related to Markush's - we've now registered all of their Markush in their Fact Cards, but these won't go public anytime soon since Dashboard updates are so delayed, so not sure what to tell them to do with the info.

Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)

Looks like I'll be spending the weekend manually updating ChemInv and PFAS lists for Kathy, Annette, etc. This is the sort of exercise that drains the life-spirit out of me and makes me think of retirement as a release from mind-numbing torture. (Sorry, I get to be Eeyore now and then 😞).

[AJW>] You are not Eeyore...more like Owl, and often 'Roo

In any case, glad to hear your meeting with Rusty went well and he's somewhat placated

Ex. 6 Personal Privacy (PP)

Ex. 6 Personal Privacy (PP)

[AJW>] Katie told me something had happened but he was okay.

– I do hope he's ok and won't be out of commission for long. But if he is, the PFAS work will be impacted, for sure. Hope everyone realizes that.

[AJW>] Uh-oh...

I agree that the ELMS training made this week seem extra-long. Hope you have a great weekend, as well, with good long walks early-in-the-day before the heat sets in.

[AJW>] Today's walk was great. ELMS was the worst training I have ever had.

Cheers,
Ann

PS I told Dieter what you said about croquet being a rather posh hoity toity game for the private school and country club lot (or something to that effect). That may be the case in the UK, but Dieter wanted me to tell you he played it while growing up poor as dirt in a trailer park in SC. And I played it as a kid in our backyard, as well, very far from the posh crowd, for sure. I think it might have less cache in the US. In any case, Dieter, Melina and I have enjoyed playing it in the evening in our back field for the past several days – easy to play and lots of fun, actually.

From: Patlewicz, Grace <Patlewicz.Grace@epa.gov>

Sent: Friday, May 15, 2020 6:05 PM

To: Williams, Antony <Williams.Antony@epa.gov>; Richard, Ann <Richard.Ann@epa.gov>

Subject: Sanity check

I missed the last discussion with OPPT etc re PFAS definitions...I assume our working definition for what constitutes a PFAS which we have defined on the Dashboard and spelt out to denote PFASSTRUCT remains unchanged?

Had my update session with Rusty..managed to come out OK from the discussion (Yay!)..was quite a productive discussion overall so he seemed somewhat placated by the fact that we had been making progress 😊 Of all the things I thought were cut and dried - the PFAS structural definition was one that threw me - I thought that was settled - just wanted to double check..since he made reference to 'recent discussions Tony had been having'..and it made me think of the Program Offices discussions regarding how to define PFAS for the Federal Register and I wondered whether anything had changed that I had lost track of.

Thanks much

Have a great weekend...catch up next week

TFIF...it's felt like an extra long week what with ELMS stuff...

Cheers

Grace